

Summary of Contracts Filed with the Minnesota PUC in March 2003

May 23, 2003

Company	Date	Agreement	Relevant State	Status of terms related to § 251(b) and (c)	Description of Terms and Status
AT&T	12/27/01	Facility Decommissioning Reimbursement Agreement	MN	Filed	This agreement was filed for approval with the Minnesota Commission on March 25, 2003.
DSLnet Communications, Inc., LLC	11/15/01	Facility Decommissioning Reimbursement Agreement	MN	Filed	This agreement was filed for approval with the Minnesota Commission on March 25, 2003.
Eschelon	03/01/02	Settlement Agreement	MN	Filed; Not in effect	<p>By its express terms, this agreement settled historical disputes between the parties.</p> <p>¶ 3(a) contains the consideration for the settlement.</p> <p>¶ 3(b) terminated pre-existing agreements as stated elsewhere in this matrix.</p> <p>¶ 3(c) contains an agreement to file an amendment to Eschelon's interconnection agreement relating to UNE-P. This amendment was filed for state commission approval in Minnesota on 7/15/02, and it was approved on 8/8/02.</p> <p>¶ 3(d) was terminated upon transition to a mechanized process, which has been fully completed.</p> <p>¶¶ 3(e) and 3(f) contain the only going-forward terms in the agreement. These provisions were filed with the Minnesota Commission on March 25, 2003.</p> <p>¶ 3(g) concerns a transition to a mechanized billing process, which has been fully performed and completed.</p>

Company	Date	Agreement	Relevant State	Status of terms related to § 251(b) and (c)	Description of Terms and Status
					Finally, ¶ 3(h) (Eschelon's withdrawal of its escalation request) is not a going forward term.
Global Crossing	7/13/01	Confidential Billing Settlement Agreement	MN	Filed; Not in effect	<p>¶ 1 is a resolution of a historical dispute with backward-looking consideration.</p> <p>¶ 2 concerns conversion to UNE-P or EEL and is the only going-forward term in the agreement. This provision was filed with the Minnesota Commission on March 25, 2003.</p>
Hickory Tech	10/03/01	Facility Decommissioning Reimbursement Agreement	MN	Filed	This agreement was filed for approval with the Minnesota Commission on March 25, 2003.
McLeod	5/01/00	Confidential Settlement Agreement	MN	Filed	<p>¶ 1 resolves a pending complaint before the Colorado Commission involving a customer located in Greeley, Colorado. It therefore reflects the settlement of a historical dispute and Section 252 does not require its filing for approval.</p> <p>Indeed, the language of this contract suggests that it was intended to apply only to Colorado, but out of an abundance of caution, Qwest has provided the provisions containing more general language to other state commissions, including Minnesota, for review and approval. Qwest filed this agreement in Minnesota on March 25, 2003.</p>
MCI	6/29/01	Business Escalation Agreement	MN	Filed	This agreement was filed with the Minnesota Commission on March 25, 2003.
MCI	6/29/01	Confidential Billing Settlement	MN	Filed; Not in effect	¶ 1 is a settlement of a historical dispute.

Company	Date	Agreement	Relevant State	Status of terms related to § 251(b) and (c)	Description of Terms and Status
		Agreement			<p>¶ 2 relates to unbundled network element combinations and has been superseded by filed and approved interconnection agreement amendments. An amendment was executed on 9/27/01 and filed with the Minnesota Commission on 10/15/01, approved on 12/05/01.</p> <p>¶ 3 is a settlement of a historical dispute and pending litigation.</p> <p>¶ 4 is also a settlement of a historical dispute with only backward-looking consideration.</p> <p>The terms related to reciprocal compensation in ¶ 5 are included in the interconnection agreement amendments executed on 6/29/01 and filed in Minnesota on 9/20/01, approved 10/31/01.</p> <p>¶ 6 is a settlement of a historical dispute.</p> <p>The portions of ¶ 7 reflecting going forward terms for the calculation of a relative use factor have been filed with the applicable states. The remainder of ¶ 7 either involved the settlement of historical disputes or the carrier-specific percentage, which would not be applicable to other carriers because that percentage is based upon carrier-specific usage.</p> <p>¶ 8 was filed in Minnesota on March 25, 2003. In addition, the business escalation agreement (above) also dated 6/29/01, which was also filed in Minnesota,</p>

Company	Date	Agreement	Relevant State	Status of terms related to § 251(b) and (c)	Description of Terms and Status
					reflects a dispute resolution process discussed in this ¶ 8.
MCI	12/27/01	Facility Decommissioning Reimbursement Agreement	MN	Filed	This agreement was filed for approval with the Minnesota Commission on March 25, 2003.
SBC	6/01/00	Letter re proposed settlement terms	MN	Filed	<p>¶¶ 1 and 3 restate established pick and choose obligations under Section 252(i) and state commission rules or orders regarding opt-in rights and approvals of interconnection agreements. These paragraphs do not present any new terms or conditions under Section 251.</p> <p>¶ 2, relating to a particular DS3 facility, has been fully performed and does not reflect any current obligations.</p> <p>¶ 4 has been identified and was filed for approval in Minnesota on March 26, 2003.</p>
SBC	10/05/01	Facility Decommissioning Reimbursement Agreement	MN	Filed	This agreement was filed for approval with the Minnesota Commission on March 25, 2003.
XO	12/31/01	Confidential Billing Settlement Agreement	MN	Filed; Not in effect	<p>¶ 1 is a settlement of historical disputes.</p> <p>¶ 2(a) and (b) reflect backward-looking consideration to resolve those disputes.</p> <p>¶ 2(c) contains terms and conditions for reciprocal compensation that were superseded and governed by filed and approved amendments to ICAs. These amendments, reflecting terms and conditions for local and ISP-bound traffic, were executed by the parties in March 2002 and filed with and approved by</p>

Company	Date	Agreement	Relevant State	Status of terms related to § 251(b) and (c)	Description of Terms and Status
					<p>the Minnesota Commission.</p> <p>¶ 2(d) involves XO bills to QC for intrastate switched access, not a Section 251 ILEC obligation or service, and therefore does not involve the 252 filing requirement.</p> <p>¶ 2(e) relates to interstate tariffed services, not local Section 251 services.</p> <p>¶ 2(f) and (g) do not contain or concern terms related to Section 251.</p> <p>¶ 3's escalation procedures and Exhibit B to the agreement have been identified and filed for approval with the Minnesota Commission on March 25, 2003.</p> <p>The remainder of this agreement does not contain any ongoing terms related to Section 251.</p>
Allegiance	05/18/20	Internetwork Calling Name Delivery Service Agreement	MN	Filed	This agreement was filed for approval with the Minnesota Commission on March 25, 2003.
MediaOne	9/27/99	8XX Database Query Service Agreement	MN	Filed	This agreement was filed for approval with the Minnesota Commission on March 26, 2003.
MediaOne	9/27/99	Internetwork Calling Name Delivery Service Agreement	MN	Filed	This agreement was filed for approval with the Minnesota Commission on March 26, 2003.
MediaOne	9/24/99	Line Information Data Base Storage Agreement	MN	Filed	This agreement was filed for approval with the Minnesota Commission on March 26, 2003.
Cady	12/17/99	Agreement for	MN	Filed	This agreement was filed for approval with the

Company	Date	Agreement	Relevant State	Status of terms related to § 251(b) and (c)	Description of Terms and Status
---------	------	-----------	----------------	---	---------------------------------

		CMDS Hosting and Message Distribution for Co-Providers (In-Region with Operator Services)			Minnesota Commission on March 25, 2003.
Cady	12/17/99	Addendum to CMDS Hosting and In-Region Message Distribution Agreement for Co-Providers	MN	Filed	This agreement was filed for approval with the Minnesota Commission on March 25, 2003.
IdeaOne	11/09/99	Transient Interim Signaling Capability Service Agreement	MN	Filed	This agreement was filed for approval with the Minnesota Commission on March 25, 2003.
InfoTel	8/06/99	Line Information Data Base Storage Agreement	MN	Filed	This agreement was filed for approval with the Minnesota Commission on March 25, 2003.
InfoTel	7/09/99	Internetwork Calling Name Delivery Service Agreement	MN	Filed	This agreement was filed for approval with the Minnesota Commission on March 25, 2003.
MainStreet	9/29/00	Internetwork Calling Name Delivery Service Agreement	MN	Filed	This agreement was filed for approval with the Minnesota Commission on March 25, 2003.
Otter Tail	11/22/00	Transit Record Exchange Agreement to Co-Carriers (Wireline-Transit Qwest-CLEC)	MN	Filed	This agreement was filed for approval with the Minnesota Commission on March 25, 2003.
Otter Tail	11/22/00	Transit Record Exchange Agreement to Co-Carriers	MN	Filed	This agreement was filed for approval with the Minnesota Commission on March 25, 2003.

Company	Date	Agreement	Relevant State	Status of terms related to § 251(b) and (c)	Description of Terms and Status
		(WSP-transit Qwest-CLEC)			
OCI	11/01/97	Internetwork Calling Name Delivery Service Agreement	MN	Filed	This agreement was filed for approval with the Minnesota Commission on March 25, 2003.
OCI	10/17/97	Agreement for CMDS Hosting and In-Region Message Distribution for Alternately Billed Messages for Co-Providers (With Operator Services)	MN	Filed	This agreement was filed for approval with the Minnesota Commission on March 25, 2003.
OCI	10/22/97	Physical Collocation Agreement	MN	Filed	This agreement was filed for approval with the Minnesota Commission on March 25, 2003.
Val-ed Joint Venture	11/06/99	Internetwork Calling Name Delivery Service Agreement	MN	Filed	This agreement was filed for approval with the Minnesota Commission on March 25, 2003.
Val-ed Joint Venture	11/19/99	Transit Record Exchange Agreement to Co-Carriers (WSP-transit USW-CLEC)	MN	Filed	This agreement was filed for approval with the Minnesota Commission on March 25, 2003.
Val-ed Joint Venture	12/02/99	Transit Record Exchange Agreement to Co-Carriers (Wireline-transit USW-CLEC)	MN	Filed	This agreement was filed for approval with the Minnesota Commission on March 25, 2003.
McLeod	4/28/00	Confidential Billing Settlement Agreement	MN	Filed; Not in effect	¶¶ 1 and 2(a) resolve past disputes regarding merger proceedings, an FCC complaint relating to subscriber list information charges, and Centrex service

Company	Date	Agreement	Relevant State	Status of terms related to § 251(b) and (c)	Description of Terms and Status
					<p>agreements. These provisions resolve past disputes, and the subject matters of these issues do not relate to services provided under Section 251(b) or (c).</p> <p>¶ 2(b) addresses two matters. First it says that the disputed amounts incurred up to March 31, 2000 are resolved and released, and McLeod will dismiss its complaint pending before the FCC regarding subscriber line charges. Second, this paragraph says that, on a going forward basis, McLeod will pay the subscriber list information rates as stated in this paragraph, or such other final rates as may be established by any cost docket proceedings or rates that the parties may negotiate. Although appearing to be a going-forward term, this provision does not fall within the filing requirement for two reasons. First, subscriber list information rates are provided pursuant to Section 222(e) of the Act, not Section 251, and this paragraph simply re-states the same rates listed in the FCC's order addressing subscriber list information under Section 222(e). Second, the express language of the provision requires the parties to use the rates set for each state through cost setting proceedings; thus the state commissions' settings of these rates apply and supersede the specific rates stated in this provision.</p> <p>¶ 2(c) provides that the parties will amend their existing interconnection agreements to change their reciprocal compensation terms from a usage-based system to a bill and keep arrangement for local and internet-related traffic. The parties in fact amended their interconnection</p>

Company	Date	Agreement	Relevant State	Status of terms related to § 251(b) and (c)	Description of Terms and Status
					<p>agreement as stated in this paragraph through an amendment filed with the applicable state commissions pursuant to Section 252(e). An amendment was filed with the Minnesota Commission on 6/19/00, approved on 9/13/00. Thus, ¶ 2(c) has been superseded and does not represent an ongoing obligation. The remainder of this paragraph addresses contingencies related to the closure, or non-closure, of the Qwest/U S WEST merger. The merger has closed, and thus these remaining provisions do not obligate the parties today.</p> <p>Qwest has identified and bracketed ¶ 2(d) for review and approval by applicable state commissions, except for the language referencing April 30, 2000. Qwest filed this provision with the Minnesota Commission on March 26, 2003.</p> <p>The final substantive paragraph is 2(e), which addresses Centrex Service Agreements, a retail offering, not a wholesale service provided under Section 251.</p>
McLeod	10/26/00	Confidential Agreement	MN	Filed	<p>¶ 1 of this contract says, in short, that by November 15, 2000, the parties are to meet to discuss and thereafter develop an implementation plan to establish processes and procedures to implement the interconnection agreement. Further, the implementation plan is to be finalized by December 15, 2000. In fact, the November 15 and December 15, 2000 dates passed, the parties did not establish an implementation plan, and there is no subsequent contract or documentation related to an implementation plan with McLeod. Further, to the best of Qwest's understanding, there are no previous</p>

Company	Date	Agreement	Relevant State	Status of terms related to § 251(b) and (c)	Description of Terms and Status
					<p>contracts that address an implementation plan. This provision was not identified and bracketed for state commission approval because it does not reflect an on-going, prospective term that creates any obligations to the parties today, because all of the conduct contemplated by the provision would have been fully performed and completed by December 15, 2000.</p> <p>¶ 2 calls for quarterly meetings to resolve business issues and disputes, and ¶ 3 outlines procedures for the escalation of disputes. Qwest bracketed these paragraphs and filed them with the Minnesota Commission on March 26, 2003.</p>
U S Link/ Info Tel	7/14/99	Letter re: In the Matter of a Complaint	MN	Filed	On March 26, 2003, Qwest filed under Section 252(e) the provisions identified by the Minnesota Commission as terms of interconnection.
Small Minnesota CLECs	4/18/00	Confidential Stipulation for Toll Services and OSS	MN	Filed	On March 26, 2003, Qwest filed under Section 252(e) the provisions identified by the Minnesota Commission as terms of interconnection.